UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/578,042	04/12/2007	Tobias Rasmusson	150-344	5325	
STEVEN S. PA	7590 02/27/200 YNE	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 6502		CHEN, JOSE V			
Washington, DC 20035			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3637		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/27/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Applic	cation No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
		10/57	8,042	RASMUSSON I	RASMUSSON ET AL.			
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
		José ∖	/. Chen	3637				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on	the cover sheet	with the correspondence	address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA ISSON OF THE MA ISSON OF THE MA ISSON OF THE MA ISSON OF THE MAN	ILING DATE OF 37 CFR 1.136(a). In n ication. tory period will apply a II, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUN o event, however, may nd will expire SIX (6) Mo e application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 09 February	2009					
'=	•)⊠ This action						
′=		<i>'</i> —		atters prosecution as to t	the merits is			
٠,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	closed in decordance with the product	andor Ex parto	Quay10, 1000 0	.5. 11, 100 0.0. 210.				
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🛛	Claim(s) <u>11,13 and 16-19</u> is/are pendi	ng in the applica	ation.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	Claim(s) 11, 13, 19, 17, 18, 19 is/are r	ejected.						
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or electio	n requirement.					
			·					
	on Papers							
-	The specification is objected to by the							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a			-				
	Applicant may not request that any objection	_	· ·					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	ne correction is re-	quired if the drawir	ng(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	D-948)	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application 				

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Hodges and Cavalier et al. The patent to Harvey teaches structure substantially as claimed including a fixture for forming unit loads to be received on two or more loading ledges, which unit loads after forming are lifted from the fixture together with the loading ledges, wherein the fixture is to receive the loading ledges and the fixture has means to adapt the positions of the loading ledges depending on the size and form of the unit loads to be formed, the fixture has an approximate rectangular frame, formed of at least two parallel long struts(11) and at least two parallel short struts (12) at the end of the long struts, a further number of intermediate (12) short

struts are arranged between the long struts, transversal bars are arranged moveable on the long struts, with the ends of each transversal bar on each long strut, locking means, the only difference being that cups are not adjustably mounted on the bars and a unit load is not lifted from the fixture. However, the patent to Hodges (30) teaches the use of providing cups to be old and the patent to Cavalier et al teaches the use of providing a "package load" lifted off from together.. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Harvey to include adjustable cups, as taught by Hodges and such structure formed as a unit, as taught by Cavalier et al since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed, as defined.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references to Sato et al, Stoddard et al, Ziemba, Farr, Lucas et al, Michaud et al, Trickett, Wullenweber, Glassmeyer, Sylvester et al, Shell, Carvin, Lair, Giesen, Courter teach structure similar to applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/578,042 Page 4

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

José V. Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3637

/José V. Chen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637